

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the time taken by the Examiner to review Applicant's present application. Claims 1-15 remain pending in this application. This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed May 4, 2004. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-15 stand rejected as anticipated by U.S. Publication No. US2001/0054046 ("Mikhailov"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1, as recited discloses a system for developing web-based collaborative applications, employing visual-based programming, using a user system to display a set of browser-based component wizards. These browser-based component wizards are used in turn to define, develop and customize application component types for the web-based collaborative application. A set of processing components is used for implementing functionality associated with a definition for each of the application component types, wherein the functionality exists prior to customization of the definition for each of the application component types. Thus, web-based applications may utilize composites of definitions of application components which have been defined or customized using browser-based component wizards and a set of processing components to implement the functionality associated with these application component types. In some embodiments, these web-based collaborative applications may include forms, business rules, reports, searches, calendars and email.

After reviewing the portions of Mikhailov cited by the Examiner, Applicant cannot locate where Mikhailov discloses definitions of application component types or a set of processing components, each processing component in the set capable of implementing functionality associated with a definition for each of the application component types. In contrast, Mikhailov discloses a forms handling system which includes a forms wizard. This forms wizard is an interface for creating forms utilizing a number of "canned" or already existent forms. The forms wizard creates the form in a format supported by at least one of the applications program contained in a library. (Paragraph [0058]). Database tables may then be created in association with these created forms. These created forms and database tables are static entities.

Thus, because the forms engine of Mikhailov uses canned "forms" to create a form in a format supported by at least one application it does not disclose creating a set of application component types or processing components, wherein each processing component in the set is

operable to implement functionality associated with a definition for each of the application component types.

With respect to Claim 2, after reviewing the portions of Mikhailov cited by the Examiner, Applicant cannot find “a combination of : a form wizard, a business rule wizard, a report wizard, a search wizard, a calendar wizard, and an email wizard,” as recited in Claim 2. The portion of Mikhailov cited by the Examiner does not disclose a business rule wizard, a search wizard, a calendar wizard, or an email wizard. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this rejection.

As per Claim 3, as pointed out above, forms wizard is an interface for creating forms utilizing a number of “canned” forms. Therefore, the forms wizard of Mikhailov is not operable to customize a definition for corresponding application component type, as asserted by the Examiner and recited in Claim 3. Consequently, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 3 as well.

With respect to Claim 4, the portion of Mikhailov cited by the Examiner discloses a “typical form submission that a visitor might enter” and a report file corresponding with this typical form submission. Applicant cannot find where within these sections Mikhailov disclose that each browser-based wizard has a set of sub-component types configured to dynamically perform the customization of the definition for the corresponding application component type.

Similarly, after reviewing the portions of Mikhailov cited by the Examiner, Applicant cannot find “sub-component types in the set of sub-component types in the browser-based wizard operable to dynamically generate a default visual representation of the customization of the definition,” as recited by Claim 5; the generation of the visual representation associating a default property definition to a properties-based portion of the definition for the corresponding application component type. Of Claim 6; a sub-component types in the set of sub-component types in the browser-based wizard operable to dynamically modify a properties-based portion of the definition with a customized property definition for the corresponding application component type as laid out in Claim 7; wherein the customized property definition for the corresponding application component type is dynamically applied by providing visual representations in a display area of the browser-based wizard according to the customized property definition as recited in Claim 8; wherein a physical property of the corresponding application component type modified by the customized property definition includes one of: orientation, position, labeling, and design as in Claim 9; wherein at least one of the sub-components types in the set of sub-component types in the browser-based wizard is operable to dynamically modify a behavior-based portion of the definition with a customized behavior definition for the

corresponding application component type as in Claim 10; wherein the customized behavior definition for the corresponding application component type is dynamically applied in accordance with the customized behavior definition to visual representations provided in a display area of the browser-based wizard as in Claim 11; wherein a behavioral property of the corresponding application component type modified by the customized behavior definition includes one of: data input type, data input length, data requirements, data modification terms and data retrieval terms as in Claim 12; wherein at least some of the sub-component types in the set of sub-component types in the browser-based wizard are operable to specify the finality of the customization of the definition for the corresponding application component as in Claim 13 or wherein the finality specifiable includes any combination of: discard customizations, implement customizations and delay customizations as in Claim 14. Consequently the withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 5-14 is respectfully requested as well.

Additionally, as Claim 15 recites similar limitations to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of this claim as well.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include acquiescence to statements, assertions, assumptions, conclusions, or any combination thereof in the Office Action. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1-15. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below for prompt action in the event any issues remain.

The Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3183 of SPRINKLE IP LAW GROUP.

Respectfully submitted,
SPRINKLE IP LAW GROUP
Attorneys for Applicant



Ari G. Akmal
Reg. No. 51,388

DATE: August 4, 2004
P.O. Box 684767
Austin, Texas 78768-4767
Tel. (512) 637.9220
Fax. (512) 371.9088